

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

The Abstract is objected to due to informalities in language and format.

Claims 1-8 are objected to due to lack of clarity for the terms “having” in line 2 of claim 1 and “by means” in line 3 claim 6.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wurst (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0104421).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Treace (U.S. Pat. No. 2,557,364).

Claims 1, 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Paulus (U.S. Pat. No. 4,114,493).

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application, with Claims 9-12 being new, and Claims 1, 11, and 12 being independent claims.

Claims 1, 3, and 6 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the objection to the Abstract, the above amendments are believed to overcome the objection.

Regarding the objection to Claims 1-8, the above amendments are believed to overcome the objection.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to Wurst, the Examiner states that Wurst anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a tool unit comprising a fastening means; and a working edge, wherein *the working edge extends with respect to a center of the fastening means over an angle being between 180° and 270°*.

Wurst discloses a tool unit 10 comprising a fastening means 26 (Fig. 1); and a working edge 24 (Fig. 1). It is obvious that, in Wurst, the working edge 24, 24a, 24b, 24 e, 24f (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 respectively) extends over an angle outside the range of 180° and 270°. By contrast, the working edge 4 of the present application extends over an angle between 180° and 270° (Fig. 2). Wurst fails to disclose at least the limitation of *the working edge extends with respect to a center of the fastening means over an angle being between 180° and 270°* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Wurst.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to Treace, the Examiner states that Treace anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Treace discloses a tool unit 25 comprising a fastening means 21 (Fig. 5); and a working edge 24, 26 (Fig. 5). Treace fails to disclose at least the limitation of *the working edge extends with respect to a center of the fastening means over an angle being between 180° and 270°* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Treace.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to Paulus, the Examiner states that Paulus anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Paulus discloses a tool unit comprising a fastening means 22 (Fig. 1); and a working edge 25, 26 (Fig. 1). The tool unit of Paulus is for a floor-mounted power tool (col. 2 lines 31-35; Fig. 1), in contrast to the tool unit for a handheld power tool of the present application. Further, the power tool of Paulus has a rotating output unit (col. 1 lines 57-61; Fig. 1), in contrast to an oscillating output unit of the present application. Paulus also fails to disclose the limitation *of the working edge extends with respect to a center of the fastening means over an angle being between 180° and 270°* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Paulus.

Regarding new independent Claims 11 and 12, no known art anticipates or renders obvious any of Claims 11 and 12.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, namely, Claims 1-12, are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 27233